Errata - January 30, 2004
ORI Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research
Steneck & Zinn,

General Note: During final design, the icons in the margins were not properly placed and therefore should be ignored. In addition, a number of illustrations, text boxes, and one case were left out, as noted below. The missing materials can be accessed at http://ori.hhs.gov.

p. 3.	Case missing
p. 4.	Box missing
p. 5.	Box missing
p. 7.	Box missing
p. 8.	Box missing
p. 13	Illustration missing
p. 39	Illustration missing
p. 52.	Illustration missing
p. 83.	Illustration misplaced; belongs p. 84, facing next chapter
p. 96.	Illustration missing
p. 121.	Illustration misplaced, belongs p. 122, facing next chapter

Case Study, p. 3.

Dr. Katherine B___, a new post-doc in a well-respected laboratory, has just had a manuscript accepted for publication in a prestigious research journal, conditional on a few changes. Most importantly, the editor requested that she significantly shorten the methods section to save space. Shortening the methods section will require leaving out information that will make it difficult for other researchers to replicate her work.

Asked about the situation, Dr. B___'s lab director and mentor suggests she make the changes. After all, if other researchers want more information they can always get in touch. She remains concerned that an inadequate explanation of her methods could lead other researchers to waste unnecessary time and resources attempting to replicate her work.

? Should Dr. B___ make the requested changes?

? Should she be concerned about providing inadequate information to colleagues?

? Is reducing detail in methods sections a reasonable way to go about saving space in journals?

? How can Dr. B___ get definitive answers to these and other questions about the responsible conduct of research?

Text box, p. 4

National Academy of Sciences, *On Being a Scientist* (1994)

The scientific research enterprise, like other human activities, is built on a foundation of trust. Scientists trust that the results reported by others are valid. Society trusts that the results of research reflect an honest attempt by scientists to describe the world accurately and without bias. The level of trust that has characterized science and its relationship with society has contributed to a period of unparalleled scientific productivity. But this trust will endure only if the scientific community devotes itself to exemplifying and transmitting the values associated with ethical scientific conduct.

http://www.nap.edu/readingroom/books/obas/preface.html

Text box, page 5.

American Chemical Society
The Chemist's Code of Conduct (1994)

Chemists Acknowledge Responsibilities To:

The Public. Chemists have a professional responsibly to serve the public interest and welfare and to further knowledge of science. …

The Science of Chemistry. Chemists should seek to advance chemical science, understand the limitations of their knowledge, and respect the truth. …

The Profession. Chemists should remain current with developments in their field, share ideas and information, keep accurate and complete laboratory records, maintain integrity in all conduct and publications, and give due credit to the contributions of others. Conflicts of interest and scientific misconduct, such as fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism, are incompatible with this Code.

The Employer. Chemists should promote and protect the legitimate interests of their employers, perform work honestly and competently, fulfill obligations, and safeguard proprietary information.

Employees. Chemists, as employers, should treat subordinates with respect for their professionalism and concern for their well-being. ...

Students. Chemists should regard the tutelage of students as a trust conferred by society for the promotion of the student's learning and professional development. ...

Associates. Chemists should treat associates with respect, regardless of the level of their formal education, encourage them, learn with them, share ideas honestly, and give credit for their contributions.

http://www.iit.edu/departments/csep/PublicWWW/codes/coe/acs-chma.htm

Text box, p. 7.

REQUIRED EDUCATION IN THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

June 5, 2000 (Revised August 25, 2000)
National Institutes of Health

Policy: Beginning on October 1, 2000, the NIH will require education on the protection of human research participants for all investigators submitting NIH applications for grants or proposals for contracts or receiving new or non-competing awards for research involving human subjects.

Background: To bolster the Federal commitment to the protection of human research participants, several new initiatives to strengthen government oversight of medical research were announced by HHS Secretary Shalala on May 30, 2000. This announcement also reminds institutions of their responsibility to oversee their clinical investigators and institutional review boards (IRBs). One of the new initiatives addresses education and training. This NIH announcement is developed in response to the Secretary's directive.

http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-00-039.html

Text box, p. 8.

Stanford University - Research Policy Handbook
Document 2.1

Title: Principles Concerning Research

Originally issued: Dec 8, 1971
Current version: Dec 8, 1971

Classification: Stanford Univesity Policy

Summary: Presents broad principles to guide the research enterprise and assure the integrity of scholarly inquiry at Stanford University.

http://www.stanford.edu/dept/DoR/rph/2-1.html

Missing Illustration, p. 13.

When research misconduct becomes public

Missing Illustration, p. 39.

How do researchers decide which animals are used in research?

Missing Illustration, p. 52.

Mentor or entrepreneur?

Missing illustration, p. 96.

Collaboration or competition?